

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 884

EA 018 488

AUTHOR Pavan, Barbara Nelson
TITLE Mentors and Mentoring Functions Perceived as Helpful to Certified Aspiring and Incumbent Female and Male Public School Administrators.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrators; Elementary Secondary Education; Employment Patterns; *Job Applicants; *Mentors; Principals; *Sex Differences; State Surveys; Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Women seeking or holding administrative positions in Pennsylvania schools reported having mentors as frequently as men, according to a statewide survey. A questionnaire was sent to 1,324 people holding administrative certificates and currently employed in public schools, and 622 responded. These were divided into 16 subgroups according to the position concerned (elementary principal, secondary principal, assistant superintendent, or superintendent), whether the respondent held the position or was seeking it, and the sex of the respondent. Among the topics addressed in the survey were mentors and mentoring functions. Respondents were asked to identify the sex and role of 3 mentors and to rate these mentors' helpfulness in 21 mentoring areas. Fewer job aspirants than incumbents reported having mentors. Males were mentors in 1,133 pairs and women in 252 pairs. Men served as mentors for women in 434 cases and women for men in 128. Mentors for superintendents were most frequently superintendents, and mentors for all other groups were most frequently principals. Psychosocial rather than career functions were deemed more helpful by both men and women. Since women, both incumbents and aspirants, reported mentoring support, it was difficult to reconcile this with the lack of women in school administrative positions. (PGD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED269884

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara Nelson
Pavan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Mentors and Mentoring Functions
Perceived As Helpful To
Certified Aspiring and Incumbent
Female and Male Public School Administrators

Barbara Nelson Pavan

Temple University

Philadelphia, PA 19122

Paper Presented at
American Education Research Association
San Francisco, California
April, 1986

EA 018 488

Abstract

Responses by 622 people were received for a mailed questionnaire sent to random sample generated by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. For each administrative position (superintendent, assistant superintendent, elementary principal, and secondary principal) the respondents were divided by whether job incumbents or aspirants and by sex resulting in 16 sub populations. Women report having mentors as frequently as men do with men generally serving as mentors to both men and women. Women rate each of the mentoring functions as more helpful than men do. The psychosocial rather than the career functions are deemed more helpful by both men and women. Since women, both incumbents and aspirants, report mentoring support, it is difficult to reconcile this with the lack of women in school administrative positions.

Mentors and Mentoring Functions Perceived As Helpful to
Certified Aspiring and Incumbent Female and Male Public
School Administrators

One reason cited for the small numbers of women in educational leadership positions is that they lack mentors and sponsors. It has generally been assumed that these are available to men. By surveying certified men and women who hold and do not hold positions as school administrators; this research documents the mentors and mentoring functions experienced by women and men seeking positions as elementary or secondary principals and assistant or superintendent jobs. Comparisons are made between those who achieve positions and those who don't as a total group and by sex.

Perspective

A considerable body of literature is available which reports on the lack of women school administrators. Jones and Montenegro (1982) give recent national statistics and Pavan (1985) presents data on the availability of a qualified female administrative job pool which shows that women hold a greater percentage of the certificates issued than of the administrative positions in Pennsylvania.

Most research on women seeking administrative positions includes comments by these women on the lack of mentors, sponsors, or support. Little documentation is available in the field of education as compared to business management studies, documenting the experience men have who seek mentors, sponsors, or support in obtaining school administrative jobs. During the late 1970's the Oregon Network was developed to assist women and minorities (Schmuck, Charters, and Carlson, 1981). Clement was instrumental in the development of NECEL in New England to assist women and in Pennsylvania, a Women's Caucus within PASA has grown under the leadership of the Secretary of Education. This is modeled on the AASA Women's Caucus noted by Jones and Montenegro (1982, 1983). Since men have been the overwhelming majority in administrative organizations, they have been using these as support groups for many years.

Since it was not known if the support available to men and women differs significantly (although that would appear to be the case), it was instructive to document support available to both men and women and if that support is of the same of different gender from the aspirant. Since the number of women is so limited in administrative positions, it would be necessary for males to mentor both men and women. Present administrators may be unaware of their mentoring behaviors or selection process for proteges.

Literature reviews (Atkinson, 1981, and Shakeshaft, 1979) surveys of women (Dias, 1976; Edson, 1980; Jones and Montenegro, 1983; Ortiz, 1982; Schmuck, 1981; and Rometo 1982) trying to ascertain why more women aren't school administrators, will mention lack of mentors or sponsorship as a possible factor. Surveys generally included one question asking the women who supported or encouraged them in order to determine the roles of mentors, if any. Valverde (1980) studied the sponsor-protege process by interviewing six sponsors and found four basic functions are provided: exposure, advice, protection, and sanction. The sponsor helps move the aspirant from the classroom by providing administrative experience, access to other district administrators, and career guidance.

In order to delineate what a mentor does for a protege in behavioral terms, the business management literature must be consulted. A list of 14 mentoring behaviors was compiled by Misserian (1982) from her survey of women managers as proteges. Collins (1983) developed a similar list of 16 mentoring behaviors from responses by 400 women to an open-ended questionnaire. Kram (1983) divided mentoring behaviors into two categories, career and psychosocial functions, based on the male and female responses of 18 mentor-pretege pairs. Career functions include sponsorship, exposure-and-visibility, coaching and protection, and

challenging assignments. The psychosocial functions which enhance competence and identity include role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling, and friendship.

Shapiro (1985) developed a list of 16 mentoring functions from the sources noted above and asked 140 middle and top level business managers both male and female to note these functions on a 7-point Likert scale as to the degree of help received from each of 4 individuals and how valuable it was. Women reported receiving more help than the men reported for each of the 16 with significant differences on the following 8 mentoring functions: Set challenging tasks, support & encouragement, growth in knowledge & self confidence, teach "tricks of the trade", opportunity to learn by observation and association, provide feedback on progress, develop leadership abilities, and encourage risk-taking.

A list of 21 mentoring functions for this study was adopted from the literature and divided into the categories of career functions and psychosocial functions. Survey respondents could rate as many as three people as to degree of helpfulness to their administrative career development or advancement on each function.

Methods

Sample

The appropriate certificate is required for employment as a school administrator in Pennsylvania. Records of names and certificates received is public information, as is the present employment position of all those in Pennsylvania school districts. The certification records contain names and certificates issued. This data source was bumped into the base of individuals currently employed in the public schools which includes individual names, current assignments, and work location addresses. Except in instances where employment in position by sex is less than 100, random samples were drawn from populations with certificates issued since January, 1970 of 100 men in position, 100 men with certificates, 100 women in position, and 100 women with certificates for each of the following administrative jobs: elementary principal, secondary principal, assistant superintendent, and superintendent.

The survey questionnaire was developed and sent on October 1, 1985 to this random sample generated by Pennsylvania Department of Education of 1,324 people holding administrative certificates and currently employed in Pennsylvania. Usable completed questionnaires were received from 622 people for a return rate of 47%. Each of the following reasons accounted for the non responses:

retirements, job changes, incorrect addresses, district offices not forwarding to the school where individual was assigned, errors in employment position data base, computer assignment errors, and unwillingness of individual to spend 30 minutes to respond to questionnaire. Follow-up telephone calls to a small number of non respondents indicated that a number of surveys did not reach their destinations.

For each position (superintendent, assistant superintendent, secondary principal, and elementary principal) the respondents have been divided by whether incumbent job holders or aspirants and by sex.

Therefore, there are sixteen sub-populations involved:

<u>Certificate</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Code</u>
1. Superintendent	Incumbent	Female	SIF
2. Superintendent	Aspirant	Female	SAF
3. Superintendent	Incumbent	Male	SIM
4. Superintendent	Aspirant	Male	SAM
5. Assistant Superintendent	Incumbent	Female	ASIF
6. Assistant Superintendent	Aspirant	Female	ASAF
7. Assistant Superintendent	Incumbent	Male	ASIM
8. Assistant Superintendent	Aspirant	Male	ASAM

9. Elementary Principal	Incumbent	Female	EPIF
10. Elementary Principal	Aspirant	Female	EPAF
11. Elementary Principal	Incumbent	Male	EPIM
12. Elementary Principal	Aspirant	Male	EPAM
13. Secondary Principal	Incumbent	Female	SPIF
14. Secondary Principal	Aspirant	Female	SPAF
15. Secondary Principal	Incumbent	Male	SPIM
16. Secondary Principal	Aspirant	Female	SPAM

The code names will be used in this paper in order to avoid repetition.

Numbers of completed surveys for each of the 16 sub groups are given in Table 1. While some numbers appear low, they reflect the size of the subgroup total population. Surveys were sent to 100 individuals in each subgroup except SIF, SAF, ASIF, and SPIF which do not have total population of 100. Response rate for SIF was 68% with 13 of the 19 responding; for ASIF was 71% with 11 of the 14 responding; SAF was 46% with 35 of the 76 responding; and for SPIF was

62% with 18 of the 29 responding. The low numbers in the incumbent categories reveal that women are not being hired for these positions. The SAF number is low because this certificate requires administrative experience which is not possible unless one is hired as a school administrator.

Instrument

The four page survey instrument was designed for those in possession of administrative certificates whether or not currently employed as a school administrator. Appropriate categories were gleaned from an extensive literature review. References given here are those most relevant to this particular paper. Actual items were obtained from Collins (1983), Kram (1983), Misserian (1982), Shapiro (1985), and Valverde (1980) for the section of the survey on mentoring.

Various parts of the instrument were piloted on women during several conference presentations. The complete instrument was piloted on a small group of men and women outside of Pennsylvania representative of those who would receive the final version of the instrument. Minor changes were made to improve the format and clarity of the directions.

In addition to personal characteristics the survey probed five areas: career pathways, job search strategies,

time usage, mentors and their functions, and barriers experienced with strategies used to overcome them.

This paper presents only the data on mentors and their functions, positions of mentors, and sex composition of the mentor protege pairs. See table 2 as to the format of the question on the survey. The top 12 items are the career functions followed by 9 psychosocial mentoring functions.

Results

Sample Characteristics

Table 1 summarizes selected sample characteristics for the total sample and the 16 subgroups. Nearly all the respondents were white with only 5.8% of the respondents noting race as black and none in any other category. While this percentage is low it is near the state-wide figure of 8.9%. Average age of total sample is 44.79. Analysis of variance between the 16 groups yields an F ratio of 5.741 with probability of 0.000. As might be expected the aspirants are younger than the incumbents. Differences in marital or paired status were by sex with males much more likely to be coupled. A raw chi square of 61.28591 with 15 degrees of freedom was significant at the 0.0000 level. Over 81% of the sample were paired with percentages in female subgroups from 54 to 72 and in male groups from 80 to 98. Men were more likely to be paired than women.

The state of Pennsylvania classifies school districts according to size. Class 1 is districts with over 350,000 students and contains only Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. There are 70 districts in class 2 with 30,000 or more students. Class 3 contains 396 districts with student populations of 5,000 to 29,999 and the remaining 33 smaller districts are in Class 4. Table 1 indicates percentage of respondents for each sub-population in varying district size classes. An adequate representation was obtained.

Sex of Mentor-Protege Pairs

In the columns on Table 3 the sex of mentor is mentioned first, then that of the protege so M-F means a male mentor and a female protege. Only 103 or 17% of the respondents report not having a mentor or just did not answer this question. A lower percentage of the aspirants than the incumbents of same sex in same position group report having mentors. There are 124 F-F and 699 M-M mentor protege pairs for a total of 823 same sex pairs. There are 434 M-F and 128 F-M pairs for a total of 562 cross sex pairs. Males are the mentors in 1133 pairs and females are mentors in 252 pairs reflective of the dominance of men in school administrative positions.

Position of Mentors

The positions or roles of the mentors as indicated by the proteges are reported in Table 4. The most frequently reported role for the mentors of the superintendent groups is that of superintendent. Incumbent superintendents most frequently have superintendents as mentors. For all other groups except one, the principal is most frequently mentioned as the mentor. Women aspiring toward the elementary principalship are most likely to perceive professors as their mentors. Spouses are the next most frequently mentioned role as mentors with 20% of the respondents naming their partners as one of three mentors.

Mentoring Functions

In order to compare the perceived helpfulness for each of the 21 mentoring functions, scores were summed for each function for each individual and then means were calculated for each subgroup and the total population (See Table 5 and 6). Possible range for each individual was from 0 to 12 with the higher scores indicating the function was more helpful. Analysis of variance was calculated for each of the 21 mentoring functions for the 16 subgroups. Probabilities for the F ratios ran from 0.0000 to 0.0149 indicating significant differences between the subgroups on each of the 21 mentoring functions. The Student-Newman-Keuls procedure was used to determine where these differences were. Between 1 and 22 pairs of groups were

significantly different at the 0.05 level on each mentoring function. In most situations the differences were between the aspiring elementary principal groups which had the lowest means and the incumbent female assistant and superintendent groups. (Complete statistical data is available from the author upon request.)

Position groups ranked. Position groups were ranked by how helpful they perceived career and psychosocial mentoring functions were to their career development. (See Table 7) The subgroups which perceived career mentoring functions as most helpful to their career advancement are ASIF, SIF, SPIF, and ASIM while the four groups which rated them the lowest are ASAM, SPAM, EPAF, and EPAM. Incumbents especially females rated career functions high, while aspirants especially males rated them the lowest. The same ranking was achieved for psychosocial mentoring functions.

Functions ranked. Mentoring functions are ranked by means for the total population for both career and psychosocial aspects on Table 8. Psychosocial functions are rated higher than career functions with 7 of the 9 psychosocial and only 5 of the 12 career functions achieving means over 6.00. The top five are: support and encouragement, enhance my self confidence, and friendship (psychosocial) followed by sponsorship and provide needed information (career). Those

functions considered least helpful are the career functions of arrange access to administrators and administrative experience, provide protection and advise on salary negotiations and the psychosocial function, facilitate move from classroom.

Comparison with Shapiro study. Of the studies previously cited, only the one by Shapiro provides sufficient data for comparative purposes. Since Shapiro surveyed men and women in top and middle management positions, comparisons must be made with the incumbent groups in this study. Shapiro did not present a total mean for each function and this study included 5 additional mentoring functions. In both studies women have higher means than men for each mentoring function, indicating that women reported mentoring received as more helpful than men do. With only two exceptions men and women in this study ranked each mentoring functions within two ranks of the total ranking. The exceptions are, risk taking ranked fifth for men and tenth for women and men ranked coaching eighteenth instead of total rank of 15.

Both surveys found men and women ranking support and encouragement and enhance my self confidence in the top four. Friendship and sponsorship were also in Pavan's top 4 while counseling and set challenging tasks standards were also in Shapiro's top 4. In the bottom 3 for both surveys

were facilitate entry and advise on salary negotiations. Protection was also noted low by Pavan's sample and sponsorships by Shapiro's sample. Differences could be due to sampling, since Pavan studied school administrators and Shapiro, business managers.

Discussion and Implications

Women report having mentors as frequently as men do. They report that each of the mentoring functions has been more helpful than men so report. Women report that males very frequently serve as mentors to females. This data seems puzzling in light of the small percentages of women currently employed in school administrative positions. In Pennsylvania (Pavan, 1985) where this study was conducted women hold 3.3% of the superintendent jobs, 7.6% of the assistant superintendent positions, and 16.9% of the elementary and 3.5% of the secondary school principalships. It does not appear that lack of mentors or support explains this sex disequity in school administration.

Do men under report the assistance which they receive? Are mentors, due to affirmative action, making special efforts to assist women? Further research of both mentors and proteges especially with mentors having both male and female proteges may lead to answers for these questions.

Since the psychosocial functions of mentoring were deemed so very important, school districts may wish to review their administrative intern plans (if any) to be sure these factors are incorporated. Career functions should also be analyzed as it may be that they are inadequately provided and, therefore, are less helpful. School boards may even wish to adopt policies which will encourage administrators to mentor potential administrative candidates.

This research supported in part by Temple University.
Opinions presented are those of the author.

REFERENCES

- Adkison, J. A. (1981). Women in school administration: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 51 (3), 311-343.
- Biklen, S. K., & Brannigan, M. B. (Eds.). (1980). Women and educational leadership. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Collins, N. W. (1983). Professional women and their mentors. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Dias, S. L. (April, 1976). The aspiration levels of women for administrative careers in education: Predictive factors and implication for effecting change. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, California.
- Edson, D. K. (1980). Female aspirants in public school administration. Why do they continue to aspire to principalships? Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene.
- Hullhorst, A. J. (1984). A comparative study of the career aspirations, job seeking patterns, and career patterns of male and female doctoral recipients in educational administration. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University.
- Jones, E. H. & Montenegro, X. P. (July, 1982). Recent trends in the representation of women and minorities in school administration and problems in documentation. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Jones, E. H. & Montenegro, X. P. (1983). Factors predicting women's upward career mobility in school administration. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 3(3), 231-241.
- Jones, E. H. & Montengro, X. P. (1982). Climbing the career ladder: A research study of women in school administration. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentoring relationship. Academy of Management Journal, 26(4), 608-625.
- Missirian, A. K. (1982). The corporate connection: Why executive women need mentors to reach the top. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Ortiz, F. I. (1982). Career patterns in education: Women, men, and minorities in public school administration. South Hadley, MA: Bergin Publishers.
- Pavan, B. N. (1985). Certified but not hired: Women administrators in Pennsylvania. Paper presented at the Research on Women and Education Conference, Boston, MA.
- Romero, L. K. (1982). Women administrators in Pennsylvania's public schools: Overcoming barriers to recruitment and promotion. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.
- Schmuck, P. A., Charters, W. W., Jr., & Carlson, R. O. (Eds.). (1981). Educational policy and management: Sex differentials. New York: Academic Press.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1979). Dissertation research on women in educational administration: A synthesis of findings and paradigm for future research. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A. & M. University, College Station, TX.
- Shapiro, G. L. (1985). Sex differences in mentoring functions received and valued by managers. Paper presented at the Academy of Management, San Diego, CA.
- Smith, J. A. (1976). A study of women who are certified and employed as principals and assistant principals in Pennsylvania. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.
- Zimmerman, J. N. (1971). The status of women in educational administrative positions within the central offices of public schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA . .

TABLE 1 - Number, Race, Age, Martial Status, District Size of Respondents

	Number	Black		Average	Married	District Size			
		N	%	Age	Paired %	Percentages			
Supt.	161	3				1	2	3	4
I F	13	0	0	48.15	53.8	0	9.1	90.9	0
A F	35	2	5.9	45.17	68.6	12.5	37.5	50.0	0
I M	60	0	0	48.08	91.7	0	8.8	82.5	8.8
A M	53	1	2	44.21	98.1	4.3	42.6	53.2	0
Asst. Sup.	149	7							
I F	11	2	20	48.36	63.6	20.0	30.0	50.0	0
A F	45	3	7	41.65	62.8	22.2	19.4	58.3	0
I M	46	0	0	46.96	93.5	4.3	41.3	54.3	0
A M	47	2	4.3	41.48	85.1	17.5	32.5	47.5	2.5
El. Pr.	171	9							
I F	51	3	6.3	45.96	72.5	37.3	17.6	43.1	2.0
A F	34	3	9.1	42.20	67.6	35.7	32.1	28.6	3.6
I M	46	1	2.3	44.71	88.9	6.7	33.3	57.8	2.2
A M	40	2	5.1	40.17	80.5	26.3	42.1	23.7	7.9
Sec. Pr.	141	16							
I F	18	6	33.3	47.89	66.7	43.8	37.5	18.8	0
A F	37	5	14.7	42.00	70.3	30.0	40.0	26.7	3.3
I M	53	4	7.8	49.69	94.3	5.9	25.5	64.7	3.9
A M	33	1	3.0	42.85	84.8	0	17.2	82.8	0
Total	622	35	5.8%	44.79	81.3	15.2	29.1	53.1	2.6

I = Incumbent
A = Aspirant

F = Female
M = Male

Table 2 Actual part of questionnaire *

10. Select 3 people who helped your administrative career development/advancement.
Rate each person by circling the number for each item.

0= Not at all 3= Considerable
1= Very little 4= Very great help
2= Some

	Person I - M F					Person II - M F					Person III - M F				
Helper's position/role															
My position then - length of relationship															
Sponsorship (Promote/recommend)	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Exposure - and - Visibility	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Coaching <i>career</i>	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Protection	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Set challenging task/performance standard	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Share expertise - "tricks of the trade"	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Provide needed information	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Chance to observe/learn by association	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Arrange administrative experience	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Advise on salary negotiations	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Provide feedback on my progress	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Arrange access to other administrators	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Role modeling	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Support and encouragement	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Counseling	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Friendship	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Encourage risk taking	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Enhance my self-confidence	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Help formulate career plan	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Act as sounding board	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
Facilitate move from classroom	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4

* Hand written not on actual questionnaire.

TABLE 3 - Sex of Mentor-Protege Pairs

	F-F	M-M	M-F	F-M	% 1 or more mentors	No mentors
Supt.	19	247	89	34	89	18
I F	3		29		85	2
A F	16		60		86	5
I M		136		12	92	5
A M		111		22	89	6
Asst. Sup.	31	172	110	37	84	24
I F	5		28		100	0
A F	26		82		87	6
I M		98		17	89	5
A M		74		20	72	13
El. Pr.	56	126	127	33	79	36
I F	38		79		88	6
A F	18		48		71	10
I M		82		15	89	5
A M		44		18	63	15
Sec. Pr.	18	154	108	24	82	25
I F	4		39		89	2
A F	14		69		87	5
I M		98		16	83	9
A M		56		8	73	25
Total	124	699	434	128	83%	103

Table 4 - Positions of Mentors

Position	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Supt.	75	6	108	22	16	68	9	20	25	2	0	8	31
IF	7	1	13	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	3	5
AF	12	0	17	8	8	9	0	9	4	1	0	1	7
IM	37	4	43	4	3	31	2	1	10	0	0	3	8
AM	19	1	35	10	5	27	7	8	10	0	0	1	11

Asst. Supt.	62	6	67	26	13	67	14	15	22	8	4	9	42
IF	5	1	7	4	3	5	0	0	2	0	0	1	5
AF	23	0	11	3	7	23	6	6	8	4	0	5	12
IM	16	5	35	12	3	16	1	2	4	3	2	2	13
AM	18	0	14	7	0	23	7	7	8	1	2	1	12

El. Pr.	41	6	44	24	20	101	7	31	21	14	1	13	28
IF	15	3	14	11	9	26	2	10	9	6	0	6	7
AF	16	0	4	1	4	11	1	9	7	5	0	1	6
IM	6	3	20	9	5	41	3	6	3	0	0	4	7
AM	4	0	6	3	2	23	1	6	2	3	1	2	8

Sec. Pr.	40	3	64	16	8	89	26	19	17	4	1	0	25
IF	7	0	10	2	3	14	2	0	2	1	0	0	3
AF	15	1	7	4	3	21	9	9	6	2	0	0	6
IM	9	2	31	7	2	35	8	6	5	1	0	0	11
AM	9	0	16	3	0	19	7	4	4	0	1	0	5
Total	218	21	283	88	57	325	56	85	85	28	6	30	126

Code Key for Positions

1 = Professor
 2 = School Board Member
 3 = Superintendent
 4 = Assistant Superintendent
 5 = Administrative Assistant

6 = Principal
 7 = Assistant Principal
 8 = Supervisor
 9 = Peer Teacher
 10 = Friend
 11 = Other Family
 12 = Parent
 13 = Spouse/Partner

Table 5 - Career Mentoring Functions Group Means

	Spons	Expo	Coach	Protect	Task	Share	Info	Obser	Exper	Salary	Feedback	Access	Total	Rank
Supt.														
I F	8.46	7.54	7.62	5.77	8.85	8.23	7.77	7.92	6.62	5.23	8.23	7.38	89.62	2
A F	7.26	6.46	5.00	5.97	6.31	5.71	6.40	5.71	5.43	3.20	5.97	5.71	69.13	7
I M	7.62	6.78	4.90	3.22	6.62	6.22	7.07	6.48	5.38	3.40	5.80	5.43	68.92	8
A M	7.72	6.83	4.75	3.53	6.32	6.21	6.68	6.15	5.77	3.15	6.51	5.96	69.58	6

Asst. Supt.														
I F	9.91	9.00	8.91	6.91	9.55	8.55	9.27	8.36	6.82	5.91	8.45	7.73	99.37	1
A F	6.67	5.31	5.78	4.20	6.09	5.89	6.76	5.71	3.91	2.33	5.47	4.64	62.67	12
I M	8.13	6.54	5.61	4.30	6.79	6.41	6.96	6.93	6.28	4.07	6.76	5.74	74.52	4
A M	6.30	5.26	5.09	3.62	5.94	5.38	5.89	5.53	4.60	2.60	5.02	4.57	59.80	13

EL. Pr.														
I F	7.14	5.75	5.84	3.51	5.92	6.45	6.92	6.35	5.04	1.80	6.20	5.10	66.02	10
A F	4.91	3.91	4.62	3.24	4.56	4.71	5.12	3.91	3.09	1.71	3.91	2.82	46.51	15
I M	6.73	6.11	5.13	3.38	5.96	6.56	6.33	6.29	5.20	2.56	5.78	4.84	64.87	11
A M	4.46	3.71	3.37	2.07	3.27	3.27	3.73	3.20	2.54	1.12	3.39	2.34	36.52	16

Sec. Pr.														
I F	8.67	7.78	6.33	4.33	7.11	7.33	8.17	7.11	6.39	2.94	6.94	6.56	79.66	3
A F	7.38	6.16	6.38	3.95	6.49	6.46	6.89	5.73	4.97	1.68	5.43	4.68	66.20	9
I M	7.77	6.96	6.00	4.53	6.34	6.49	6.72	6.11	5.49	3.89	6.42	5.72	72.44	5
A M	6.73	5.27	4.64	2.85	4.61	5.67	5.58	5.12	4.88	3.21	4.85	4.70	58.11	14
Total	7.06	6.02	5.34	3.83	6.03	6.01	6.45	5.87	5.00	2.84	5.74	5.03	65.22	

Table 6 - Psychosocial Mentoring Function Group Means

	Role	Support	Counsel	Friend	Risk	Confid.	Plan	Sound	Move	Total	Rank
Supt.											
I F	8.15	9.54	8.62	9.15	9.85	10.00	8.00	9.92	4.46	77.69	2
A F	6.63	8.00	6.31	6.60	6.23	7.43	5.11	6.20	4.51	57.02	10
I M	6.20	8.78	6.63	7.68	7.42	8.02	5.28	6.78	4.05	61.06	7
A M	6.42	8.85	6.74	7.58	6.62	7.62	5.38	6.87	5.04	61.12	6

Asst. Supt.											
I F	9.36	11.00	9.64	9.00	9.36	10.55	7.91	9.00	8.00	83.82	1
A F	6.51	7.98	5.80	7.20	6.96	7.62	5.64	6.40	3.64	57.75	9
I M	6.83	8.70	7.22	8.20	7.35	7.72	6.41	7.43	4.85	64.71	4
A M	5.64	7.21	5.55	6.66	5.64	6.49	5.04	5.55	3.83	51.61	13

El. Pr.											
I F	6.59	8.31	6.86	7.27	6.39	7.61	5.51	6.25	4.53	59.32	8
A F	4.79	6.09	4.82	6.12	4.88	5.68	3.35	5.00	2.24	42.97	15
I M	6.91	7.98	6.22	7.47	5.67	7.47	4.89	5.73	4.58	56.93	11
A M	3.20	5.44	4.37	4.93	4.56	4.49	3.51	4.10	2.56	37.16	16

Sec. Pr.											
I F	7.89	8.83	7.33	7.94	6.94	8.67	7.17	6.89	6.22	67.88	3
A F	6.08	7.62	6.57	6.84	6.41	7.22	4.46	5.70	4.49	55.39	12
I M	6.30	7.96	6.85	7.77	7.09	7.36	6.00	6.45	5.38	61.16	5
A M	5.27	6.39	5.88	6.30	5.21	5.91	5.21	5.36	4.88	50.47	14
Total	6.18	7.89	6.36	7.17	6.44	7.24	5.31	6.23	4.38	57.20	

Table 7 - Position Groups Ranked According to Perceived Helpfulness on Career and Psychosocial Mentoring Functions

<u>Career Functions</u>			<u>Psychosocial Functions</u>	
<u>Sum of Means</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Sum of Means</u>
99.37	ASIF	1	ASIF	83.82
89.62	SIF	2	SIF	77.69
79.66	SPIF	3	SPIF	67.88
74.52	ASIM	4	ASIM	64.71
72.44	SPTM	5	SPTM	61.16
69.58	SM	6	SM	61.12
69.13	SAF	7	SIM	61.06
68.92	SIM	8	EPIF	59.32
66.20	SPAF	9	ASAF	57.75
66.02	EPIF	10	SAF	57.02
64.87	EPTM	11	EPTM	56.93
62.67	ASAF	12	SPAF	55.39
59.80	ASAM	13	ASAM	51.61
58.11	SPAM	14	SPAM	50.47
46.51	EPAF	15	EPAF	42.97
36.52	EPAM	16	EPAM	37.16
65.22		1-16		57.20

Table 8 - Mentoring Functions Ranked from Most to Least Helpful

Mentoring Functions

<u>X</u>	<u>Career</u>	<u>Rank Order</u>	<u>Psychosocial</u>	<u>X</u>
		1	Support and encouragement	7.89
		2	Enhance my self-confidence	7.24
		3	Friendship	7.17
7.06	Sponsorship (promote/ recommend)	4		
6.45	Provide needed information	5		
		6	Encourage risk taking	6.44
		7	Counseling	6.36
		8	Act as sounding board	6.23
		9	Role modeling	6.18
6.03	Set challenging task standard	10		
6.02	Exposure/visibility	11		
6.01	Share expertise "tricks of the trade"	12		
5.87	Chance to observe/learn by association	13		
5.74	Provide feedback on my progress	14		
5.34	Coaching	15		
		16	Help formulate career plan	5.31
5.03	Arrange access to administrators	17		
5.00	Arrange administrative experience	18		
		19	Facilitate move from classroom	4.38
3.83	Protection	20		
2.84	Advise on salary negotiations	21		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 9 - Comparison of Pavan and Shapiro Studies

	Pavan Study						Shapiro Study			
			Incumbents				Male		Female	
			Total Mean (Rank)	Male Mean (Rank)	Female Mean (Rank)		$\bar{X}$ (Rank)	$\bar{X}$ (Rank)		
Support and encouragement	7.89	1	8.35	1	9.42	1	5.51	1	5.82	1
Enhance my self confidence	7.24	2	7.64	3	9.21	2	5.08	3	5.73	2
Friendship	7.17	3	7.73	2	8.34	4	—	—	—	—
Sponsorship (Promote/recommend)	7.06	4	7.56	4	8.55	3	3.89	14	4.02	14
Provide needed information	6.45	5	6.77	6	8.03	6	4.38	7	4.69	9
Encourage risk taking	6.44	6	6.88	5	7.78	10	4.22	10	5.05	6
Counseling	6.36	7	6.64	7	8.12	5	5.13	2	5.43	3
Act as sounding board	6.23	8	6.60	8.5	8.01	7	—	—	—	—
Role modeling	6.18	9	6.56	10	8.0	8	—	—	—	—
Set ch`llenging tasks/standards	6.03	10	6.43	12	7.85	9	5.04	4	5.40	4
Exposure/visibility	6.02	11	6.60	8.5	7.52	12	3.96	13	4.29	12
Share "Tricks of Trade"	6.01	12	6.42	13	7.64	11	4.34	8	4.81	8
Observe/learn by association	5.87	13	6.45	11	7.43	13	4.43	6	4.99	7
Provide feedback on progress	5.74	14	5.99	14	7.40	14	4.18	11	4.61	11
Coaching	5.34	15	5.41	18	7.17	15	—	—	—	—
Help formulate career plan	5.31	16	5.64	15	7.15	16	3.99	12	4.28	13
Arrange access to administrators	5.03	17	5.43	17	6.69	17	—	—	—	—
Arrange administrative experience	5.00	18	5.58	16	6.22	18	4.24	9	4.62	10
Facilitate move from classroom	4.38	19	4.71	19	5.80	19	3.42	15	3.81	15
Protection	3.83	20	3.86	20	5.13	20	4.89	5	5.10	5
Advise on salary negotiations	2.84	21	3.48	21	3.47	21	3.35	16	3.54	16
	Range of Means = 0-12 Ranks = 1-21						Range of Means = 0-7 Ranks = 1-16			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE